IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5667 of 1985

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE S.K.KESHOTE
==
1.   Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed
        to see the judgements?

2.   To be referred to the Reporter or not?

3.   Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy
        of the judgement?

4.   Whether this case involves a substantial question
        of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution
        of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?

5.   Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

        P R PARMAR
Versus
        STATE OF GUJARAT

        Appearance:
            None present for Petitioner
            SMT SIDDHI TALATI for Respondent No. 1, 2

        CORAM : MR.JUSTICE S.K.KESHOTE
        Date of decision: 14/08/97

ORAL JUDGEMENT
        1. The matter was called out for hearing in the
        first round then in the second round and lastly, in the
        third round, but none put appearance on behalf of the
        petitioner. Heard   the   learned   counsel   for   the
        respondents and perused the special civil application.

        2. The petitioner, as per her own case, has been
        given the temporary work on part-time basis from time to

time at T.B. Sanitorium, Sadra. Prayer has been made by the petitioner in this special civil application for direction to the respondents to make the appointment of the petitioner as permanent employee as a Ward Servant/Aya/Sweeper.

3. From the statement which has been filed by the petitioner in this special civil application as annexure `C' at Page No.20, I found that during the period from 1972 to 1984, the petitioner has been given the part-time engagement for 14 times and total working days of these 12 years comes only to 312. In the year 1984, it appears that the petitioner has worked for about 115 days more. So the claim of the petitioner that she is working since 1972 is apparently a wrong averment. From the statement aforesaid, it comes out that for some days she has been given the appointment as a part-time and it was only a fixed term appointment, which does not give any right of permanency. This special civil application is wholly misconceived and the same is dismissed. Rule discharged.

   ****